

**REMARKS**

The Final Office Action mailed September 9, 2004, has been received and reviewed. Claims 1 through 4, 6 through 11, 13, 20 through 24, 27, 30 through 33, 35 36, and 43 through 46 are currently pending in the application. Claims 9, and 20 through 23 have been withdrawn as being drawn to a non-elected species. Claims 1, 4, 6 through 8, and 11 stand rejected. Claims 24, 27, 30 through 32, 35, 36, 43, and 44 are allowed. Claims 10, 13, 33, 45, and 46 have been objected to as being dependent upon rejected or cancelled base claims, but the indication of allowable subject matter in such claims is noted with appreciation.

Per this response, Applicant has cancelled claim 10 and amended claims 1, 4, 8, 13, 33, 45 and 46. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application as proposed to be amended herein.

**Objections to Claims 13, 33, 45 and 46**

The Examiner objects to claims 13, 33, 45 and 46 because each of such claims depends from a now cancelled claim. Applicant proposes to amend claim 13 to be an independent claim and proposes amendments to claims 33, 45 and 46 to correct the dependency thereof. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 13, 33, 45 and 46.

**35 U.S.C. § 102(b) Anticipation Rejections**

**Anticipation Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 5,987,742 to Acciai et al.**

Claims 1, 4, 8, and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Acciai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,742). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. *Verdegaal Brothers v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Claims 1 and 11

Claim 1, as amended herein, includes the subject matter that was previously set forth in claim 10, which subject matter has been indicated as being allowable by the Examiner. Applicant, therefore, submits that claim 1 is in condition for allowance and that claim 11 is allowable at least by virtue of its dependency from an allowable base claim.

Applicant, therefore, requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 1 and 11.

Claims 4 and 8

Applicant has amended each of claims 4 and 8 such that they depend from claim 13. Furthermore, Applicant has amended claim 13, which the Examiner indicated as containing allowable subject matter, rewriting claim 13 as an independent claim including all the limitations of the claim from which it previously depended. As such, Applicant submits that claim 13 is in condition for allowance and, additionally, that claims 4 and 8 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from an allowable base claim.

Applicant, therefore, requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 4 and 8.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections**

Obviousness Rejection Based on U.S. Patent No. 5,987,742 to Acciai et al. in View of U.S. Patent No. 5,690,504 to Scanlan et al.

Claims 6 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Acciai et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,987,742) in view of Scanlan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,690,504).

Each of claims 6 and 7 depend from claim 1. As set forth hereinabove, claim 1, as amended herein, includes the subject matter that was previously set forth in claim 10, which subject matter has been indicated as being allowable by the Examiner. Applicant, therefore, submits that claims 6 and 7 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency from an allowable base claim.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 6 and 7.

**Objections to Claims 10 and 13/Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 10 and 13 stand objected to as being dependent upon rejected or cancelled base claims, but are indicated to contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if placed in appropriate independent form.

As discussed hereinabove, Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to include the subject matter of claim 10. Additionally, Applicant has rewritten claim 13 as an independent claim including all of the limitations that were set forth in the claim from which it previously depended. As such, Applicant submits that claims 1 and 13 are now in condition for allowance and respectfully request the same.

**Withdrawn Claims**

Applicant submits that claim 1 is generic as to claims 20 and 21. Applicant further submits that claim 13 is generic as to claims 22 and 23 which Applicant has amended herein to depend from claim 13.

Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims 20 through 24.

**ENTRY OF AMENDMENTS**

The amendments to claims 1, 4, 8, 13, 33, 45 and 46 above should be entered by the Examiner because the amendments are supported by the as-filed specification and drawings and do not add any new matter to the application. Further, the amendments do not raise new issues or require a further search.

**CONCLUSION**

Claims 1, 4, 6 through 11, 13, 20 through 24, 27, 30 through 33, 35, 36 and 43 through 46 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner determine that additional issues remain which might be resolved by a telephone conference, he is respectfully invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Bradley B. Jensen", followed by a long horizontal flourish.

Bradley B. Jensen  
Registration No. 46,801  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
TRASKBRITT  
P.O. Box 2550  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550  
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: November 11, 2004

BBJ/nj:dh

Document in ProLaw